



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/500,609	07/01/2004	Koichi Shinkai	Q81987	4319
65565	7590	08/23/2007	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE-265550			RIVAS, SALVADOR E	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVE. NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3213			2616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/500,609	SHINKAI, KOICHI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Salvador E. Rivas	2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on July 1, 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in response to Applicant's amendments filed on June 13, 2007.

Claims 1 and 2 are now pending in the present application. **This Action is made non-final.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Betts et al. (U.S. Patent # 4,669,090)** in view of **Scott (U.S. Patent # 5,396,486)** and further in view of **Ito (U.S. Patent # 4,459,589)**.

Regarding claim 1, **Betts et al.** teach a half-duplex communication control method (Column 1 Lines 7-8 "...a modem which may be operated in a half-duplex mode...") in which a first device and a second device are connected by two signal lines (Fig.1, Column 3 Lines 66-68 - Column 4 Line 1, "a local modem 100 is connected to a

Art Unit: 2616

remote modem 200 through a two-wire communication channel 300 for exchanging data between DTE's (data terminal equipments) 400 and 500..."), half-duplex communication in one-to-one correspondence is conducted (Column 1 Lines 7-8 "...a modem which may be operated in a half-duplex mode..."), also turns back its sending request output inside the first device to check a communicable state as a sending request input inside the first device (Column 4 Lines 26-28, "...the circuit 26 sends a CTS (clear-to-send) signal back to DTE 400 indicating that it is ready to accept data."), and also turns back its sending permission output inside the second device to check a communicable state as a sending permission input inside the second device (same procedure applied from Column 4 Lines 26-28, except to where the procedure takes place in Fig. 1@ 200, 500). However, Betts et al. fails to teach each of the two devices notifies the opponent device of a state as to whether each device is communicable, wherein the first device outputs a sending request output for providing notification of a state of a communication request from the first device to the second device as a sending request signal using an open collector buffer, and if the second device is receivable with respect to the sending request signal sent from the first device, the second device outputs a sending permission output for providing notification of a communicable state from the second device to the first device as a sending permission signal using an open collector buffer.

Scott teaches a call establishment process between two modems (Fig. 1 @ 100,300) that includes modem handshaking and training in order to establish a data connection (Fig.2, Column 4, Lines 24-28). The modem handshaking process allows for said two modems (Fig. 1 @ 100,300) to dynamically negotiation sets parameters of a

Art Unit: 2616

communications channel established between said two modems prior to establishing a normal communication over the channel. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Scott with Betts et al. for the purpose of initializing and establishing a data connection between two devices using half-duplex communication. The motivation to combine is to efficiently establish a transmit data path.

However Scott and Betts et al. fail to teach an open collector buffer in each of its devices. Ito uses an open collector output type buffer between the output of a cable receiver and the common line to prevent any disruptions to the data connection (Column 3, Lines 30-34 and 37-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ito with Scott and Betts et al. for the purpose of enabling a data connection between two devices using half-duplex communication. The motivation to combine is to efficiently maintain a transmit data path.

Regarding **claim 2**, and **as applied to claim 1**, Betts et al., as modified by Scott and Ito, teach a half-duplex communication control method (Column 1 Lines 7-8 "...a modem which may be operated in a half-duplex mode...") wherein with respect to time which elapses before outputting another sending request output if outputting sending request outputs simultaneously from two devices, time respectively varying with respect to the two devices is randomly determined by a program of a microcomputer (Fig.2, Column 2 Lines 31-33, "The transmitter incorporates a randomizer which is used to randomize the data so that the adaptive equalizer can function.").

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1 and 2** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE NON-FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or early communications from the Examiner should be directed to Salvador E. Rivas whose telephone number is (571) 270-1784. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30AM to 5:00PM.

Art Unit: 2616

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Kenneth N. Vanderpuye can be reached on (571) 272- 3078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Salvador E. Rivas
S.E.R./ser

August 9, 2007



KENNETH VANDERPUYE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER